UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,786	02/14/2002	David Emmett	M-12563 US	3708

7590   05/06/2004

Skjerven Morrill MacPherson LLP
28th Floor
Three Embarcadero Ctr.
San Francisoc, CA 94111

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED

MAY 2 6 2004

Technology Center 2100

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-23 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over de Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster").

As to claims 1 and 21, Hilster teaches the claimed limitations:

"creating a list having entries, individual entries of the list containing

content of associated ones of the blocks" as creating a list entries such as 11/96-

7/97 Relocation Assistance Coordiantor, 3/95/-10/96 English teacher (fig. 7, col.

2, lines 55-65);

. "providing a database including a data structure associated with the

document, the data structure specifying a manner of displaying at least one of

the entries" as providing a database 14 including a web page forms associated

with the resume. A web page form is specified to displaying entries of resume

(col. 4, lines 55-67; col. 5, lines 1-20). .

"inserting entries of the list into the data structure to form an output file".

Inserting text strings within fields 94 according to the syntax of the source

document/ file 12 and definition e.g., name, address, city, etc of each field 94.

The stored resume from resume storage is also added to the third web page

form. Finally, the third web page form is sent back to the user site where it is

displayed by the web browser on monitor (col. 5, lines 30-45).

Hilster does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "dividing a document

having a first structure into blocks" as a resume is divided into parts such as

Experience, Education, Certificates and Interests (fig. 7, col. 2, lines 55-65);

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of a resume is divided

into parts such as Experience, Education, Certificates and Interests in order to

convert loosely structured document to another structure document that can be

read by a user.

As to claim 2, Hilster teaches the claimed limitation "further comprising

transmitting at least a portion of the output file over a network to a client device"

as (col. 5, lines 30-65).

As to claim 6, Hilster teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the output file

contains sub-documents and a table of contents page listing the labels, wherein

individual sub-documents are associated with individual labels" as (fig. 6C).

As to claim 7, Hilster teaches the claimed limitation "extracting a structure

of the document to form an extracted data structure associated with the

document; modifying the extracted data structure; storing the modified extracted

data structure as the data structure" as (col. 3, lines 40-67).

4.   Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster") in view of Cheng et al (or hereinafter "Cheng") (USP 6421656).

As to claim 3, Hilster discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "assigning a classification to individual list entries". Cheng teaches assigning a classification to entries as nodes (fig. 11).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Cheng's teaching of assigning a classification to entries as nodes to Hilster's system in order to store content of a document in order for a user to view and to retrieve content or a portion of a document quickly.

As to claim 4, Hilster discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "merging list entries having the same classification". Cheng teaches merging nodes of the same path (col. 15, lines 60-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Cheng's teaching of merging nodes of the same path to Hilster's system in order to save memory save for storing document.

5.   Claims 5, 8, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over de Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster") in view of Jeyaraman

(USP 6377957).

As to claim 5, Hilster discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in

claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein the creating a list further

comprises re-ordering the list according to the content of individual list entries".

Jeyaraman teaches re-ordering nodes within a tree (fig. 6E).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to apply Jeyaraman's teaching of re-ordering nodes

within a tree to Hilster's system in order to transform a old data structure into a

new data structure.

As to claim 8, Hilster discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in

claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein the modifying the extracted data

structure further comprises adding labels to the extracted data structure".

Jeyaraman teaches each node or end leaf of tree can be added, deleted,

or modified (fig. 6)

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to apply Jeyaraman's teaching of each node or end

leaf of tree can be added, deleted, or modified to Hilster's system in order to

transform a old data structure into a new data structure.

As to claim 9, Hilster teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the modifying the extracted data structure further comprises removing a portion of the extracted data structure" as (col. Lines 50-67).

As to claim 10, Hilster teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the modifying the extracted data structure further comprises removing a portion of the extracted data structure from a first location within the extracted data structure and adding the portion of the extracted data structure at a second location within the extracted data structure" as (col. 5, lines 50-67).

6.   Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster") in view of Sedlar (USP 6549916).

As to claim 11, Hilster discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 7, except the claimed limitation "wherein the document comprises an HTML document, an XML document, or a PDF document". Sedlar teaches HTML document and XML document (col. 18, lines 60-67).

It would has been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to Sedlar's HTML document and XML document to Hilster's system in order to allow a user to view different format of a document

7.   Claims 12, 22, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster") in view of Fields et al (or hereinafter "Fields") (USP 6128655).

As to claims 12 and 22, Hilster teaches the claimed limitations:

"extracting a structure of a first document to form a first data structure" as

(col. 3, lines 5-40);

"modifying the first data structure to form a second data structure" as (col.

4, lines 55-67);

"the content of the second document being different from content of the

first document" as (col. 2, lines 60-67).

Hilster does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "extracting content of

a second document; inserting the content of the second document into the

second data structure".

Fields teaches that retrieving a HTML page and inserting the content of

HTML page within a template or a data structure (col. 4, lines 50-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of retrieving a HTML

page and inserting the content of HTML page within a template or a data

structure to Hilster's system in order to reduce the expense and effort of

providing content in a new hosting web site and to allow a publisher of an

electronic document to control the reformatting of the document by a host site, to

automatically update material on the hosting web site as it is changes on the

content provider web sites.

As to claim 13, Hilster teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the modifying the first data structure further comprises deleting a portion of the first data structure" as (fig. 6, col. 4, lines 55-65).

As to claim 15, Hilster teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the first and second documents are web pages" as (col. 4, lines 55-67).

8.   Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster") in view of Fields et al (or hereinafter "Fields") (USP 6128655) and further in view of Jeyaraman.

As to claim 14, Hilster discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 12, except teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the modifying the first data structure further comprises adding a label to a portion of the first data structure". Jeyaraman teaches each node or end leaf of tree can be added, deleted, or modified (fig. 6)

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Jeyaraman's teaching of each node or end leaf of tree can be added, deleted, or modified to Hilster's system in order to transform a old data structure into a new data structure.

9.   Claims 16 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Cheng et al (or hereinafter "Cheng") (UPS 6421656).

As to claims 16 and 23, Cheng teaches the claimed limitations:

"extracting a first data structure from a first document, content of the first

document being stored in nodes of the data structure" as retrieving XML

documents that are stored in a tree. This tree has nodes for storing the content

of the documents (fig. 8, col. 15, lines 50-65);

"assigning a label to the nodes of the first data structure that store the

content of the document based on the content stored in the nodes" as (fig.8, col.

15, lines 50-65).

Cheng does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "generating a one-

dimensional list of the nodes that include the content of the document".

However, Cheng teaches storing XML documents in created columns of a

relational database. A column is represented as a one-dimensional (col. 3, lines

55-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to apply Cheng's teaching of storing XML

documents in created columns of a relational database in order to minimize the

computer time used and the cost performing a query and to provide a fast search

documents stored in column data.

10.   Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Cheng et al (or hereinafter "Cheng") (UPS 6421656) in view of Fields.

As to claim 17, Cheng discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 16, except the claimed limitation "providing a database including a second data structure associated with the first document, the second data structure specifying a manner of displaying at least one of the entries; inserting entries of the list into the data structure to form an output file". Fields teaches that providing a database 109 that contains templates associated with HTML page. The system displays the template after inserting HTML page to a user (col. 4, lines 50-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Fields's teaching of providing a database 109 that contains templates associated with HTML page. The system displays the template after inserting HTML page to a user to Cheng's system in order to provide an accuracy of documents in proper format to a user for viewing or reading.

As to claim 18, Cheng discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 16, except the claimed limitation "extracting a structure of a second document to form a second data structure, the second document having a same structure as the first document; modifying the second data structure to form a third data structure; storing the third data structure in a database".

Fields teaches providing a database 109 that contains templates associated with HTML page. The system displays the template or web page

after inserting HTML page to a user. This web page which is represented as a third data structure is stored in a database (col. 4, lines 50-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Fields's teaching of providing a database 109 that contains templates associated with HTML page. The system displays the template after inserting HTML page to a user to Cheng's system in order to provide a accuracy of documents in proper format to a user for viewing or reading.

As to claim 19, Cheng teaches the claimed limitation "removing at least one portion of the second data structure" as (col. 3, lines 60-65).

As to claim 20, Cheng discloses the claimed limitation "wherein the modifying further comprises moving at least one portion of the second data structure from a first location within the second data structure to a second location within the data structure" as (col. 3, lines 60-65).

Conclusion

11.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Meltzer et al (USP 6125391).

Contact Information

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam-Y Truong whose telephone number is (703-605-1169). The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (703-305-9790). The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-3900).

Cam-Y Truong

4/29/04

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-5,999,939	12-1999	de Hilster et al.	707/102
	B	US-6,421,656	07-2002	Cheng et al.	707/2
	C	US-6,377,957	04-2002	Jeyaraman, Thulasiraman	707/200
	D	US-6,549,916	04-2003	Sedlar, Eric	707/200
	E	US-6,128,655	10-2000	Fields et al.	709/219
	F	US-6,125,391	09-2000	Meltzer et al.	709/223
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Patent and Trademark Office			Atty Docket No.	Serial No.
			M-12563 US	10/076,786
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT			Applicants	
(Use several sheets if necessary)			Emmett et al.	
			Filing Date	Group
			February 14, 2002	Unknown

APR 0 3 2002

U.S. Patent Documents

*Examiner Initial		Document Number	Date	Name	Class	Subclass	Filing Date If Appropriate
	AA						
	AB						
	AC						
	AD						
	AE						
	AF						
	AG						
	AH						
	AI						
	AJ						
	AK						

Foreign Patent Documents

		Document	Date	Country	Class	Subclass	Translation Yes	No
	AL							
	AM							
	AN							
	AO							
	AP							

OTHER ART (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.)

cy	AQ	Rahman et al., "Automatic Summarization of Web Content to Smaller Display Devices," September 12, 2001, ICDAR '01 Final Program.
	AR	
	AS	

Examiner Cammy	Date Considered 4/29/04

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with your communication to applicant.

Via EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO. EV 029 354 177 US

v-1

Organization _____ **TC2100** ____ Bldg./Room ____ **PK2** ____

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
IF UNDELIVERABLE RETURN IN TEN DAYS

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

SKJEC03* 94117303 1203 12 05/24/04
FORWARD TIME EXP RTN TO SEND
:SKJERVEN MORRILL LLP
800 POWELL ST
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94108-2006

RETURN TO SENDER

ll..ll..ll.l.ll.l.ll..l.ll..ll..ll.l.ll.l.lll..l

U.S. OFFICIAL MAIL
PENALTY
FOR
PRIVATE
USE $300

MAY 06'04

PB METER
7251870

=3.85=

U.S. POSTAGE